

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

The present amendment is submitted in response to the Final Office Action mailed July 21, 2011. In view of the amendments above and remarks to follow, reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Status of Claims

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1, 2, 4-10, 14-16 and 18-24 will remain pending in this application. Claims 1, 14 and 18 have been amended. Applicants respectfully submit that no Previously Presented matter is added by the present amendments.

Interview Summary

Applicants appreciate the courtesy granted to Applicant's attorney, Michael A. Scaturro (Reg. No. 51,356), during a telephonic interview conducted on Thursday, September 15, 2011. During the telephonic interview, possible amendments to the claims were discussed.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

- I. In the Office Action, Claims 1, 6-10, 14-16 and 18, 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shalit et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,714,971) in view of Freeze, Internet Explorer 5, 1999 in further view of McCollum (U.S. Patent Publication No. 20030112467 in further view of Sommer (U.S. Patent Application No. 20040100504). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to recite features not disclosed or suggested by Shalit / Freeze / McCollum / Sommer, taken alone or in any proper combination. In particular, none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose or suggest

wherein the at least first menu of the content structure displayed in the first static panel is replaced with the first sub-menu of the currently highlighted item of the first menu shown in the second static panel, the replacement of the first static panel being performed simultaneous with the replacement of the first sub-menu shown in the second static panel with the first sub-sub-menu of the currently highlighted item of the second menu shown in the third static panel...

Claim 1 now more clearly and precisely recites that the first menu is replaced with the first sub-menu, **simultaneous with** the first sub-menu being replaced with the first sub-sub menu. It is respectfully submitted that none of the cited references, alone or in combination teach applicant's newly recited claim limitation.

In the Office Action, the Examiner correctly states that Freeze and Shallit do not specifically disclose the claimed aspect of a first menu in a first panel being replaced with the first sub-menu of the second static panel. The Examiner cites McCollum for remedying the deficiency in Freeze and Shallit. However, McCollum does not disclose a first menu replace with the first sub-menu, **simultaneous with** the first sub-menu being replaced with the first sub-sub menu, as claimed.

In the Office Action, the Examiner further correctly states that Shallit, Freeze and McCollum do not disclose the claimed aspect of the first sub-menu in the second static panel being replaced with the first sub-sub-menu of the third static panel upon selection a currently highlighted item of the first menu displayed in the first panel. The Examiner cites Sommer for remedying the deficiency in Shallit, Freeze and McCollum. However, Sommer does not disclose a first menu replace with the first sub-menu, **simultaneous with** the first sub-menu being replaced with the first sub-sub menu, as claimed.

It is therefore shown that none of the cited references teach or suggest, a first menu replace with the first sub-menu, **simultaneous with** the first sub-menu being replaced with the first sub-sub menu, as claimed.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Shallit, Freeze, McCollum or Sommer, alone or in combination, suggest the limitations of claim 1 and that claim 1 is allowable. Because claims 6-10 and 20-21 depend on, and, therefore, contain all of the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable.

It is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 14 and 18 have been amended to recite similar features as those of independent Claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) with respect to Claims 14 and 18 and allowance thereof are respectfully requested. Because claims 15-16 depend on, and, therefore, contain all of the limitations of claims 14, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable.

- II. The Office has rejected claims 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shallit, Freeze, McCollum and Sommer and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,062,453 (“Clarke”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

As explained above, the cited portions of Shallit, Freeze, McCollum and Sommer do not disclose or suggest each and every element of independent claim 1 from which claims 22-24 depend. Clarke does not disclose each of the elements of claim 1 that are not disclosed by Shallit, Freeze, McCollum and Sommer. For example, the cited portions of Clarke fail to disclose or suggest,

wherein the at least first menu of the content structure displayed in the first static panel is shown to be replaced with the first sub-menu of the currently highlighted item of the first menu shown in the second static panel, the replacement of the first static panel being performed simultaneous with the replacement of the first sub-menu shown in the second static panel with the first sub-sub-menu of the currently highlighted item of the second menu shown in the third static panel, and


Instead, Clarke is merely cited for teaching a user selecting a number of static panels in accordance with a user preference. Hence claim 1 is allowable and claims 22-24 are allowable, at least by virtue of their respective dependence from claim 1.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, Claims 1, 6-10, 14, 16 and 18-24 are believed to be in condition for allowance and patentably distinguishable over the art of record.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call Mike Belk, Esq., Intellectual Property Counsel, Philips Electronics North America, at 914-333-9643.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael A. Scaturro
Reg. No. 51,356
Attorney for Applicants

Mailing Address:
Intellectual Property Counsel
Philips Electronics North America Corp.
P.O. Box 3001
345 Scarborough Road
Briarcliff Manor, Previously Presented York 10510-8001